

Joseph R. Manning, Jr., Esq. (State Bar No. 223381)  
**MANNING LAW, APC**  
20062 SW Birch Street, Ste. 200  
Newport Beach, CA 92660  
Office: (949) 200-8755  
DisabilityRights@manninglawoffice.com

Attorney for Plaintiff: GEORGE AVALOS

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

GEORGE AVALOS, an individual,  
Plaintiff,

v.

CRUISE AMERICA, INC., a Florida  
corporation; PSI INVESTMENTS, a  
California general partnership; and  
DOES 1-10, inclusive,  
Defendants.

**Case No.**

**Complaint For Damages And  
Injunctive Relief For:**

- 1. VIOLATIONS OF THE  
AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES  
ACT OF 1990, 42 U.S.C. §12181 *et*  
*seq.* as amended by the ADA  
Amendments Act of 2008 (P.L. 110-  
325).**
- 2. VIOLATIONS OF THE UNRUH  
CIVIL RIGHTS ACT, CALIFORNIA  
CIVIL CODE § 51 *et seq.***

Plaintiff, GEORGE AVALOS (“Plaintiff”), complains of Defendants  
CRUISE AMERICA, INC., a Florida corporation; PSI INVESTMENTS, a  
California general partnership; and Does 1-10 (“Defendants”) and alleges as follows:

**PARTIES**

1. Plaintiff is substantially limited in performing one or more major life  
activities, including but not limited to: walking, standing, ambulating, and sitting.  
As a result of these disabilities, Plaintiff relies upon mobility devices, including at

1 times a wheelchair, to ambulate. With such disabilities, Plaintiff qualifies as a  
2 member of a protected class under the Americans with Disabilities Act, 42 U.S.C.  
3 §12102(2) as amended by the ADA Amendments Act of 2008 (P.L. 110-325)  
4 (“ADA”) and the regulations implementing the ADA set forth at 28 C.F.R. §§  
5 36.101 et seq. At the time of Plaintiff’s visits to Defendants’ facility and prior to  
6 instituting this action, Plaintiff suffered from a “qualified disability” under the ADA,  
7 including those set forth in this paragraph. Plaintiff is also the holder of a Disabled  
8 Person Parking Placard.

9         2. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendant  
10 PSI INVESTMENTS, a California general partnership, owned the property located  
11 at 3980 Saco Rd., Bakersfield, CA 93308 (“Property”) on or around November 7,  
12 2020 upon which Cruise America RV Rentals & U Haul Truck Rentals (“Business”) is located.

13  
14         3. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendant  
15 PSI INVESTMENTS, a California general partnership, currently owns the Property.

16         4. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendant  
17 CRUISE AMERICA, INC., a Florida corporation, owned, operated, and controlled  
18 the Business located at the Property on November 7, 2020.

19         5. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendant  
20 CRUISE AMERICA, INC., a Florida corporation, owns, operates, and controls the  
21 Business located at the Property currently.

22         6. The Business is an RV and U Haul rental center open to the public,  
23 which is a “place of public accommodation” as that term is defined by 42 U.S.C. §  
24 12181(7).

25         7. Plaintiff does not know the true name of DOE Defendants, that may be  
26 related to the Business and/or Property. Plaintiff is informed and believes that each  
27 of the Defendants herein, including Does 1 through 10, inclusive, is responsible in  
28 some capacity for the events herein alleged. Plaintiff will seek leave to amend when

1 the true names, capacities, connections, and responsibilities of the Defendants and  
2 Does 1 through 10, inclusive, are ascertained.

3 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

4 8. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this action pursuant  
5 to 28 U.S.C. § 1331 and § 1343(a)(3) & (a)(4) for violations of the ADA.

6 9. This court has supplemental jurisdiction over Plaintiff's non-federal  
7 claims pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367, because Plaintiff's Unruh Civil Rights Act,  
8 California Civil Code § 51 *et seq.*, ("UCRA") claims are so related to Plaintiff's  
9 federal ADA claims in that they have the same nucleus of operative facts and  
10 arising out of the same transactions, they form part of the same case or controversy  
11 under Article III of the United States Constitution.

12 10. Venue is proper in this court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1391 because the  
13 real property which is the subject of this action is located in this district and because  
14 Plaintiff's causes of action arose in this district.

15 **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

16 11. Plaintiff went to the Business on or about November 7, 2020 for the  
17 dual purpose of inquiring about pricing and to confirm that this public place of  
18 accommodation is accessible to persons with disabilities within the meaning federal  
19 and state law.

20 12. Unfortunately, although parking spaces were one of the facilities  
21 reserved for patrons, there were no designated parking spaces available for persons  
22 with disabilities that complied with the 2010 Americans with Disabilities Act  
23 Accessibility Guidelines ("ADAAG") on November 7, 2020.

24 13. At that time, instead of having architectural barrier free facilities for  
25 patrons with disabilities, Defendants have: a built up curb ramp that projects from  
26 the sidewalk and into the access aisle (Section 406.5). Furthermore, the curb ramp is  
27 in excess of the maximum grade allowed by ADAAG specifications (Section 406.1);  
28 and, an accessible parking space that is not clearly marked (Section 502.2).

1           14.   Parking spaces are one of the facilities, privileges, and advantages  
2 reserved by Defendants to persons at the Property serving the Business.

3           15.   Because Defendant PSI INVESTMENTS, a California general  
4 partnership, owns the Property, which is a place of public accommodation, they are  
5 responsible for the violations of the ADA that exist in the parking area and  
6 accessible routes that connect to the facility's entrance that serve customers to the  
7 Business.

8           16.   Subject to the reservation of rights to assert further violations of law  
9 after a site inspection found *infra*, Plaintiff asserts there are additional ADA  
10 violations which affect him personally.

11           17.   Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges Defendants had  
12 no policy or plan in place to make sure that there was compliant accessible parking  
13 reserved for persons with disabilities prior to November 7, 2020.

14           18.   Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges Defendants have  
15 no policy or plan in place to make sure that the designated disabled parking for  
16 persons with disabilities comport with the ADAAG.

17           19.   Plaintiff personally encountered these barriers. The presence of these  
18 barriers related to Plaintiff's disability denies Plaintiff his right to enjoy accessible  
19 conditions at public place of accommodation and invades legally cognizable  
20 interests created under the ADA.

21           20.   The conditions identified *supra* are necessarily related to Plaintiff's  
22 legally recognized disability in that Plaintiff is substantially limited in the major life  
23 activities of walking, standing, ambulating, and sitting; Plaintiff is the holder of a  
24 disabled parking placard; and because the enumerated conditions relate to the use of  
25 the accessible parking, relate to the slope and condition of the accessible parking and  
26 accessible path to the accessible entrance, and relate to the proximity of the  
27 accessible parking to the accessible entrance.

28           21.   As an individual with a mobility disability who at times relies upon a

1 wheelchair or other mobility devices, Plaintiff has a keen interest in whether public  
2 accommodations have architectural barriers that impede full accessibility to those  
3 accommodations by individuals with mobility impairments.

4 22. Plaintiff is being deterred from patronizing the Business and its  
5 accommodations on particular occasions, but intends to return to the Business for the  
6 dual purpose of availing himself of the goods and services offered to the public and  
7 to ensure that the Business ceases evading its responsibilities under federal and state  
8 law.

9 23. Upon being informed that the public place of accommodation has  
10 become fully and equally accessible, he will return within 45 days as a “tester” for  
11 the purpose of confirming their accessibility. *Civil Rights Educ. and Enforcement*  
12 *Center v. Hospitality Props. Trust*, 867 F.3d 1093, 1096 (9th Cir. 2017).

13 24. As a result of his difficulty experienced because of the inaccessible  
14 condition of the facilities of the Business, Plaintiff was denied full and equal access  
15 to the Business and Property.

16 25. The Defendants have failed to maintain in working and useable  
17 conditions those features required to provide ready access to persons with  
18 disabilities.

19 26. The U.S. Department of Justice has emphasized the importance of  
20 enforcing laws that prohibit unlawful discriminatory behavior, especially in the era  
21 of the COVID-19 emergency. *See Statement by Assistant Attorney General for Civil*  
22 *Rights Eric S. Dreiband Protecting Civil Rights While Responding to the*  
23 *Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19)* found at  
24 [https://www.ada.gov/aag\\_covid\\_statement.pdf](https://www.ada.gov/aag_covid_statement.pdf).

25 27. The violations identified above are easily removed without much  
26 difficulty or expense. They are the types of barriers identified by the Department of  
27 Justice as presumably readily achievable to remove and, in fact, these barriers are  
28 readily achievable to remove. Moreover, there are numerous alternative

1 accommodations that could be made to provide a greater level of access if complete  
2 removal were not achievable.

3 28. Given the obvious and blatant violation alleged hereinabove, Plaintiff  
4 alleges, on information and belief, that there are other violations and barriers in the  
5 site that relate to his disability. Plaintiff will amend the complaint, to provide proper  
6 notice regarding the scope of this lawsuit, once he conducts a site inspection.  
7 However, the Defendants are on notice that the Plaintiff seeks to have all barriers  
8 related to his disability remedied. See *Doran v. 7-11*, 524 F.3d 1034 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2008)  
9 (holding that once a plaintiff encounters one barrier at a site, the plaintiff can sue to  
10 have all barriers that relate to his disability removed regardless of whether he  
11 personally encountered them).

12 29. Without injunctive relief, Plaintiff will continue to be unable to fully  
13 access Defendants' facilities in violation of Plaintiff's rights under the ADA.

14 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

15 **VIOLATIONS OF THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT OF 1990,**

16 **42 U.S.C. § 12181 et seq. as amended by the ADA Amendments Act of 2008**

17 **(P.L. 110-325)**

18 30. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all paragraphs alleged  
19 above and each and every other paragraph in this Complaint necessary or helpful to  
20 state this cause of action as though fully set forth herein.

21 31. Under the ADA, it is an act of discrimination to fail to ensure that the  
22 privileges, advantages, accommodations, facilities, goods, and services of any place  
23 of public accommodation are offered on a full and equal basis by anyone who owns,  
24 leases, or operates a place of public accommodation. See 42 U.S.C. § 12182(a).  
25 Discrimination is defined, inter alia, as follows:

- 26 a. A failure to make reasonable modifications in policies, practices,  
27 or procedures, when such modifications are necessary to afford  
28 goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or

accommodations to individuals with disabilities, unless the accommodation would work a fundamental alteration of those services and facilities. 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(ii).

b. A failure to remove architectural barriers where such removal is readily achievable. 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(iv). Barriers are defined by reference to the ADAAG, found at 28 C.F.R., Part 36, Appendix "D".

c. A failure to make alterations in such a manner that, to the maximum extent feasible, the altered portions of the facility are readily accessible to and usable by individuals with disabilities, including individuals who use wheelchairs, or to ensure that, to the maximum extent feasible, the path of travel to the altered area and the bathrooms, telephones, and drinking fountains serving the area, are readily accessible to and usable by individuals with disabilities. 42 U.S.C. § 12183(a)(2).

32. Any business that provides parking spaces must provide accessible parking spaces. 2010 Standards § 208. Under the 2010 Standards, access aisles shall be at the same level as the parking spaces they serve. Changes in level are not permitted. 2010 Standards § 502.4. "Access aisles are required to be nearly level in all directions to provide a surface for wheelchair transfer to and from vehicles." 2010 Standards § 502.4 Advisory. Here the failure to provide a level access aisle in the designated disabled parking space is a violation of the law and excess slope angle in the access pathway is a violation of the law.

33. A public accommodation must maintain in operable working condition those features of its facilities and equipment that are required to be readily accessible to and usable by persons with disabilities. 28 C.F.R. § 36.211(a).

34. Here, the failure to ensure that accessible facilities were available and ready to be used by Plaintiff is a violation of law.



35. Given its location and options, Plaintiff will continue to desire to patronize the Business but he has been and will continue to be discriminated against due to lack of accessible facilities and, therefore, seeks injunctive relief to remove the barriers.

## **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

### **VIOLATION OF THE UCRA, CALIFORNIA CIVIL CODE § 51 *et seq.***

36. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all paragraphs alleged above and each and every other paragraph in this Complaint necessary or helpful to state this cause of action as though fully set forth herein.

37. California Civil Code § 51 *et seq.* guarantees equal access for people with disabilities to the accommodations, advantages, facilities, privileges, and services of all business establishments of any kind whatsoever. Defendants are systematically violating the UCRA, Civil Code § 51 *et seq.*

38. Because Defendants violate Plaintiff's rights under the ADA, Defendants also violated the UCRA and are liable for damages. (Civ. Code § 51(f), 52(a).) These violations are ongoing.

39. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendants' actions constitute discrimination against Plaintiff on the basis of a disability, in violation of the UCRA, Civil Code § 51 *et seq.*, because Defendants have been previously put on actual or constructive notice that the Business is inaccessible to Plaintiff. Despite this knowledge, Defendants maintain its premises in an inaccessible form, and Defendants have failed to take actions to correct these barriers.

## **PRAYER**

**WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays that this court award damages provide relief as follows:**

1. A preliminary and permanent injunction enjoining Defendants from further violations of the ADA, 42 U.S.C. § 12181 *et seq.* as amended by the ADA



1 Amendments Act of 2008 (P.L. 110-325), and UCRA, Civil Code § 51 *et seq.* with  
2 respect to its operation of the Business and Property; Note: Plaintiff is not invoking  
3 section 55, *et seq.*, of the California Civil Code and is not seeking injunctive relief  
4 under the Disabled Persons Act (Cal. C.C. §54) at all.

5 2. An award of actual damages and statutory damages of not less than  
6 \$4,000 per violation pursuant to § 52(a) of the California Civil Code;

7 3. An additional award of \$4,000.00 as deterrence damages for each  
8 violation pursuant to *Johnson v. Guedoir*, 218 F. Supp. 3d 1096; 2016 U.S. Dist.  
9 LEXIS 150740 (USDC Cal, E.D. 2016); and,

10 4. For reasonable attorneys' fees, litigation expenses, and costs of suit,  
11 pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 12205; California Civil Code § 52.

12  
13 **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

14 Plaintiff hereby respectfully requests a trial by jury on all appropriate issues  
15 raised in this Complaint.

16  
17 Dated: December 9, 2020

**MANNING LAW, APC**

18  
19 By: /s/ Joseph R. Manning Jr., Esq.  
20 Joseph R. Manning Jr., Esq.  
21 Attorney for Plaintiff  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28